

JEFFERSON, THE GREAT EXPANSIONIST.

CONCERNING TERRITORIAL LIMITATIONS IN THE CONSTITUTION.

"An amendment of the Constitution seems necessary for this [the acquisition of Louisiana]. In the meantime, we **MUST RATIFY** and pay our money, as we have treated for a thing beyond the Constitution, and rely on the nation to sanction an act **DONE FOR ITS GREAT GOOD** without its previous authority."—Thomas Jefferson to John Dickinson, August 9, 1803.

"AMERICA, NORTH AND SOUTH," TO BE OURS.

"Our present Federal limits are not too large for good government. Our confederacy must be viewed as the nest from which all **AMERICA, NORTH AND SOUTH**, is to be peopled."—Thomas Jefferson to Archibald Stuart, January 25, 1786.

CONSENT OF INHABITANTS NOT ESSENTIAL.

"I think Clarke might be trusted with a general hint of the possibility of opposition from Spain, and instructions to sound in every direction, and let us know the force Spain has there, where posted, **HOW THE INHABITANTS ARE LIKELY TO ACT IF WE MARCH A FORCE THERE [to New Orleans].**"—Thomas Jefferson to James Madison, Secretary of State, Sept. 14, 1803.

Expansion, growth, progress—are synonymous.

The men who have succeeded in America and elsewhere, who have been of use to their country and thanked by posterity, have been expansionists in the true sense of the word.

The history of America has been "Expansion" from the beginning until to-day—and the great step that has been taken as a result of our latest victory is not expansion's end, but a glorious reaffirmation of the fundamental law of American growth.

Liberty is expansion, life is expansion.

Contraction, stagnation, lifelessness—those conditions mark the decay of a nation.

That they are far from us still is happily proved in the great events that have marked this year.

Jefferson's Gifts to the Nation.

The greatest expansionist in our history is unquestionably Thomas Jefferson. He was an expansionist in theory and an expansionist in practice. He added 1,120,000 square miles to the territory of the United States; more than doubling the area of the Republic, besides causing the occupation of the Territories of Oregon and Washington that had no owners.

Strangely enough, this great believer in American growth, this man who added many nations to the nation that chose him for leader, is quoted with apparent conviction against expansion.

In the Journal yesterday Colonel William J. Bryan, with characteristic eloquence quoted the **GREAT DEMOCRAT** in support of views which we earnestly declare to be opposed to Jefferson's deepest convictions.

Colonel Bryan will be heard respectfully by every American, for he has been able to command the confidence of six millions of his fellow citizens.

But we believe that a further study of the matter, and a further examination into the real sentiment of the nation, will work a change in Colonel Bryan's mind and bring him to the view which the Journal holds.

For with many other Americans—at first doubtful—Colonel Bryan saw his way eventually to heartiest indorsement of the war which this newspaper urged in the belief that America is still ready to fight against oppression without counting the cost.

The Journal does not believe that citation of the views of men long dead—however great—can permanently settle questions of to-day. It would discuss to-day's problems in the light of to-day's conditions rather than refer for judgment to the great dead who never knew the steamship, the telegraph, or ever dreamed that an American President would one day talk across the ocean and open the fire of his war ships ten thousand miles away by pressure on an electric key.

A brief inquiry into Jefferson's real sentiments will not be valueless, however, if it shall inspire with argument or with confidence those Democrats who think of national glory first, putting partisan advantage in the second place.

Some Jeffersonian Expressions on Expansion.

Against the acquisition of the Philippines without the consent of the archipelago's heterogeneous populations Jefferson is quoted. No man can say what he thought. We know what he did.

He realized that New Orleans was essential to our welfare—New Orleans farther away then, in days' travel, than are the Antipodes to-day.

His declaration was that we must get it by force if necessary.

He did not inquire concerning the disposition or acquiescence of the human beings to be annexed until he had taken his positive stand.

He was conscious of an unchangeable purpose to give to those men and women complete liberty and just government. But first came in his mind the need of the union—that controlled him. Not the Declaration of Independence, with its "just government derived from the consent of the governed," which Jefferson wrote; not even the Constitution could stand between him and a duty that had arisen since the writing of Declaration and Constitution.

On August 9, 1803, he wrote from Monticello to John Dickinson:

There is a difficulty in this acquisition (Louisiana) which presents a handle to the malcontents among us, though they have not yet discovered it. Our confederacy is

certainly confined to the limits established by the Revolution. The General Government has no powers but such as the Constitution has given it; and it has not given it a power of holding foreign territories, and still less of incorporating it in the Union. An amendment of the Constitution seems necessary for this. In the meantime we **MUST RATIFY** and pay our money, as we have treated for a thing beyond the Constitution and rely on the nation to sanction an act done **FOR ITS GREAT GOOD** without its previous authority.

Jefferson said: "Our confederacy is certainly confined to the limits established by the Revolution."

He added this in substance:

"But the nation's needs are not confined within those limits. We shall expand them and get the people's consent, having acted for its great good."

The Democrat of to-day who says:

"Our nation is limited to the Western Hemisphere by tradition," can certainly afford to add: "But the duty of responsibilities assumed is greater than tradition. Greater expansion is needed for the nation's great good."

This Half of the World to Be Ours.

How magnificently broad was Jefferson's view of America's destiny. No doubt in his mind of his nation's fitness to rule at a distance or of her ability to give to others the blessings that she had won for herself.

In his day the slow rumbling wagon had yet to make its way across this continent. The nation was a small handful of men, thinly peopling an Eastern strip of our possessions. Yet he foresaw our dominion over this half of the world, North and South.

It is said that Jefferson **THOUGHT** we ought not to go outside our present limits. But hear again what he **SAID**. He wrote from Paris to Archibald Stuart on January 25, 1786:

"Our present Federal limits are not too large for good government. Our confederacy must be viewed as the nest from which all **AMERICA, NORTH AND SOUTH**, is to be peopled. We should take care not to think it for the interest of the continent to press too soon on the Spaniards. Those countries cannot be in better hands. My fear is that they are too feeble to hold them till our population can be sufficiently advanced to gain it from them piece by piece.

That letter shows Jefferson—wise, cool, far-seeing. Let Spain keep her territories—she is weak. Those countries cannot be in better hands. Why? Because it will be easy for us to "GAIN them, piece by piece." Not because it will be easy to get them by coaxing, or at the request of the inhabitants, but easy to **GAIN** them for this country's good, and for the good of the natives to be annexed—whether they might like it or not.

Repeatedly comes up in Jefferson the expression of a belief in force when force is necessary.

First came his question: "What do we need?"

And second: "Are we strong enough to get it?"

To John Bacon he wrote, on April 30, 1803:

Although I am not sanguine in obtaining a cession of New Orleans for money, yet I am confident in the policy of putting off the **DAY OF CONTENTION** for it till we are **STRONGER** in ourselves and stronger in allies.

No mawkishness there. No hesitancy on the score of any man's rights or interests save the rights and interests of the United States. Jefferson was the servant of the United States—what it needed he wanted, and what he wanted for his country he got if he could.

Again in 1803 he expressed his belief in force. This time, on September 14, he wrote to James Madison, Secretary of State:

I think it possible that Spain, recollecting our former eagerness for the island of New Orleans, may imagine she can, by a free delivery of that, redeem the residue of Louisiana, and that she may withhold the peaceable cession of it. **IN THAT CASE, NO DOUBT, FORCE MUST BE USED.** I think Clarke might be trusted with a general hint of the possibility of opposition from Spain, and instructions to sound in every direction, and let us know the force Spain has there, where posted, how the inhabitants are likely to act if we march a force there, etc.

He wanted to know how the inhabitants felt, but he meant to have the territory, however they might feel, and knowledge concerning their sentiments could not change his plans—if they could be carried out safely.

It is interesting to note in those old days already existent the idea that Spain by giving up certain things might retain others—the idea still alive in her mind when she hoped by yielding Luzon to keep the other islands in slavery. Jefferson in power

was prepared to resist Spain in that, as America to-day has resisted Spain in the same line of evasion.

Read Jefferson's letter, written on April 18, 1802. It was addressed to Robert L. Livingston, representing the United States in Paris, but it was meant for Napoleon Bonaparte:

The cession of Louisiana and Florida by Spain to France works most sorely on the United States. It plainly reverses all the political relations of the United States, and will form a new epoch in our political course. Of all nations of any consideration France is the one which has hitherto offered the fewest points on which we could have any conflict of right; and the most points of a communion of interest. From these causes we have ever looked to her as our friend, as one with which we never could have occasion to differ. Her growth, therefore, we viewed as our own, her misfortunes ours.

THERE IS ON THE GLOBE ONE SINGLE SPOT, THE POSSESSOR OF WHICH IS OUR NATURAL AND HABITUAL ENEMY. IT IS NEW ORLEANS. France, placing herself in that door, assumes to us the attitude of defiance. Spain might have maintained it quietly for years. Her pacific disposition, her feeble state, would induce her to increase our facilities there, so that her possession of the place would be hardly felt by us, and it would not, perhaps, be very long before some circumstances might arise which might make the cession of it to us the price of something of worth to her. Not so can it ever be in the hands of France. The day that France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence which is to restrain her forever within her low water mark.

Is there anything uncertain, diffident or timid about that statement of this nation's attitude toward the Emperor Napoleon? Jefferson wanted land which Napoleon—in perfectly legal fashion—proposed to take, and as plainly as words could do it he announced his intention to fight for that land, and keep at it until he got it.

A good example for all—Democrats and Republicans—who may be entrusted with their country's welfare and guidance.

Cuba and Mexico Jefferson looked upon as our possessions soon to be. He wrote to Madison in 1809:

I suppose the conquest of Spain will soon force the delicate question on you as to the **FLORIDAS AND CUBA**, which will offer themselves to you. Napoleon will certainly give his consent, without difficulty, to our receiving the Floridas, and with some difficulty, perhaps, **CUBA**, and though he will disregard the obligation whenever he thinks he can break it with success, yet it has a great effect on the opinion of our people and the world to have the right moral on our side.

Jefferson appreciated the importance of having the right moral on our side, as may be noticed. But even more earnestly did he feel the importance of having the right territory within our boundaries.

Two years before he had written in a letter to Madison:

I had rather have war against Spain than not, if we go to war against England. Our southern defensive force can take the Floridas, volunteers for a **MEXICAN** army will flock to our standard, and rich pabulum will be offered to our privateers in the plunder of their commerce and coast. **PROBABLY CUBA WOULD ADD ITSELF TO OUR CONFEDERATION.**

He wrote to the Secretary of War August 12, 1808:

Should England make up with us, while Bonaparte continues at war with Spain, a moment may occur when we may, without danger of commitment with either France or England, **SEIZE TO OUR OWN LIMITS OF LOUISIANA as OF RIGHT**, and the residue of the **FLORIDAS as REPRISAL** for spoliation.

Of digging among the letters of a dead man, this is enough.

These quotations, we believe, will convince a Democrat of open mind that confidence in America's future, belief in America's growth and expansion, do not constitute treason to Jefferson, the great Democrat.

He could not foresee with all his wisdom our wonderful future.

With fewer than four millions of Americans behind him he was ready to defy England, Spain and France when it came to the fighting point. He preferred waiting until we should be "a little stronger." But when the time for expansion had come he was for expansion, immediate and in spite of everything.

Jefferson's America was small, weak, poor comparatively. To-day we number eighty millions, and the nation's resources are beyond counting.

The years which have made the nation great have made the globe much smaller. Power is concentrated more and more in the hands of a few nations. The permanent division of the whole earth is now making.

What shall be our attitude?

Shall we not spread as far as they will reach the doctrines preached by Jefferson?

Shall we not extend to others the liberty which we have won for ourselves?

Shall we not continue to hold in power, in growth and **EXPANSION** our first place among the nations of the earth?

W. R. HEARST.

DEMOCRACY'S EXPANSION RECORD.

The present area of the United States is 3,613,127 square miles. The Philippines comprise 114,326 square miles, or a little over **3 per cent** of the extent of the Union.

In 1803 the United States contained 823,765 square miles. Thomas Jefferson, the founder of Democracy, annexed 1,120,000 square miles in Louisiana, much more than **doubling the area** of the Republic. Jefferson also caused the occupation of the unowned territories of Oregon and Washington.

In 1819 the Democratic party, under James Monroe, took in Florida, which was just about equivalent then to the Philippines now.

From 1845 to 1853 the Democracy, under Polk and Pierce, took in 750,000 square miles of Texan and Mexican territory, amounting to **37 per cent** of the previous extent of the United States.

The various Democratic annexations under Jefferson, Monroe, Polk and Pierce in the fifty years from 1803 to 1853 aggregated nearly **three times the original area of the Union** as Jefferson found it. That is to say, the United States, which some timid Democrats now say will be ruined by an addition of **three per cent** to its area, took in under those great Democratic leaders additions amounting to **THREE HUNDRED per cent** and thrived by them. When the Democratic party went out of power in 1861 it left the Union nearly **four times** as large as when it went into power in 1801.

The States of Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Texas, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, California, Oregon and Washington, and the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma and the Indian Territory have been built in the regions annexed by the Democracy. What would our Republic be without them? Who would give them up?

Doubtless there must be Small Americans as long as human nature retains its diversity, but is it not unaccountable that any of them, with such a party history to look back upon, should call themselves Democrats?—From the Editorial Page of The Journal, Nov. 18th, 1898.